UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,429	02/13/2002	Rosa Martani	3-31105A	8742

1095 7590 02/21/2003

THOMAS HOXIE
NOVARTIS, PATENT AND TRADEMARK DEPARTMENT
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 430/2
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080

EXAMINER	
TRAN, SUSAN T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/075,429	MARTANI, ROSA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan Tran	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 November 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's Amendment, and Request for Extension of Time filed 11/26/02.

Double Patenting

Non-statutory Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 12-26 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,083,531 ('531). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '531 claims a solid pharmaceutical dosage form comprising active substance, filler, binding agent, and usual auxiliaries. The solid dosage form is a quick dissolve formulation, which disintegrates in the mouth within 15 seconds.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner maintains the double patenting rejection.

Applicant argues that the composition claims (12-26) of the present invention are significantly different and have at least one additional limitation over claims 1-15 of '531. The current invention requires a disintegration agent in the dosage composition, unlike the composition of '531, which does not require such agent. Contrary to the applicant's argument, although the composition of '531 does not specifically recite "disintegration agent", the claims recite binding agent, and optionally usual auxiliaries. The binding agent is selected from the group of starch, cellulose materials, gelatin, polyvinylpyrrolidone, and gum. Therefore, it is the position of the examiner that the binding agent of '531 and the disintegration agent (agents based on sodium carboxymethyl cellulose and starch, poly-N-vinyl-2-pyrrolidone) of the present invention are substantially the same. Thus, those of ordinary skill would expect a similar quick disintegrate formulation from the use of the instant invention given the claims of '531. There are no unusual and/or unexpected results which would rebut prima facie obviousness. As such, the instant claims would have been obvious given the claims of '531, which set out a similar composition using the same active agent, same filler, same binding agent as claimed herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the words "either" in lines 6 and 10 are confusing because it gives two meanings to the claimed limitation. What happen to the active substance in step (a)(2)?

Claims 1-3 are indefinite in the use of the phrase "other pharmaceutical ingredients" or "other ingredients" or "all other ingredients". The phrase renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear what "other ingredients" includes? The claims include elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "other ingredients"), thereby rendering the scope of the claims unascertainable. It is suggested to further clarify "other ingredients" in a more definite term, such as excipient, binder, filler, or disintegrant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 12-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Humbert-Droz et al. WO 97/38679.

Humbert-Droz teaches fast disintegrating oral dosage form comprising active agent, filler, binding agent (disintegration agent), and talc as lubricant pages 3-4, and claims 1-13. The dosage form can be a tablet, which disintegrate in the mouth within 15 seconds, and have a density of 200-1000 mg/ml (pages 5-6). The dosage form is prepared without applying any freeze-drying, or any compression force (page 5).

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that the present invention is different from Humbert-Droz because the present composition not only contains a binding agent but also contains a disintegrating agent. Contrary to the applicant's argument, it is noted that the requirement of a binding agent is not in the claims. Applicant's generic claim 12 a dosage form comprises (1) an active substance, (2) a filler, and (3) a disintegrant. No-where in the claim require the use of binding agent. Nonetheless, the binding agent of Humbert-Droz is selected from starch, cellulose materials, gelatin, polyvinylpyrrolidone, and gum. Accordingly, it is the position of the examiner that the binding agent of Humbert-Droz and the disintegration agent (agents based on sodium carboxymethyl cellulose and starch, poly-N-vinyl-2-pyrrolidone) of the present invention are substantially the same.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humbert-Droz et al.

Humbert-Droz teaches process for preparing fast disintegrating oral dosage form discloses in pages 5-6. It appears that Humbert-Droz is silent as to the teaching of compacting a suitable amount of the prepared powder or granulate as claimed in step (c). However, it is the position of the examiner that no criticality is seen in the particular step, since the prior art obtains the same result desire by the applicant, e.g., fast disintegrating oral dosage. Although, Humbert-Droz does not teach compacting the prepared powder or granulate, the extra step does not impart patentability over the applied prior art. Applicant's desire to produce rapidly dissolving dosage form, Humbert-Droz produces rapidly dissolving oral dosage form. Thus, it would have been prima facie obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to, by routine experimentation modify Humbert-Droz with the expectation of similar result, because Humbert-Droz teaches a rapidly dissolving oral dosage form having the same density and the same disintegrating time. With regarding to the composition claims, it is the position of the examiner that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Humbert-Droz's composition to obtain the claimed invention because Humbert-Droz teaches a rapidly dissolving oral dosage form having the claimed density of 200-1000 mg/ml, and disintegrating time of within 15 seconds (pages 2-5).

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that the examiner conclusion is improper, because as illustrated at page 2 of the present specification, the present process assures a uniform content of ingredients, a uniform dosage weight, a less drying time, and the like. In response to applicant's argument that the reference fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a uniform content of ingredients, a uniform dosage weight, a less drying time, and the like) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). The examiner has not been able to determine the unexpected and/or unusual results of the claimed process over that of Humbert-Droz. Applicant's desired is to obtain a rapidly dissolving dosage form, Humbert-Droz uses a similar process to also obtain a rapidly dissolving dosage form desired by the applicant.

Applicant argues that the Examiner's conclusion statement does not establish a rejection under 35U.S.C. 103, and requests withdrawal of the rejection. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon

improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Applicants' claims require a dosage form comprises (1) an active substance, (2) a filler, and (3) a disintegrant. Humbert-Droz teaches a dosage form comprises an active agent, a filler, and a binder selected from starch, cellulose materials, gelatin, polyvinylpyrrolidone, and gum. Although Humbert-Droz does not teach the use of a disintegrant, the binder of Humbert-Droz includes materials similar to the claimed disintegrant. Accordingly, it is the position of the examiner that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to, by routine experimentation select a suitable binding agent with the expectation of at least similar result.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Tran whose telephone number is (703) 306-5816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page, can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3592.

Gollamudi S. Kishore, PhD
Primary Examiner
Group 1500